

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 and 14-22 are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on March 16, 2011. During the interview, Applicant's representative described differences between the cited prior art and claims 1-4, 6 and 7 of the present application. In particular, the feature of claims 1, 3 and 6 of providing a single set of name data for the road for use in all of the map area blocks in which the road is present was discussed. Also, the feature of claims 2, 4 and 7 of providing a single set of name data for the map layers and the map area blocks was discussed. Additional comments are presented below.

Claims 1-11 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite based on the recitation of "the individual map area blocks" in claims 1, 3 and 6 and the recitation of "the individual map layers" in claims 2, 4 and 7. The claims are amended to remove the word "individual" from these terms, thereby removing the bases for the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-11, 17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Saeki et al (US 6,320,518) in view of Angwin (US 6,559,865).

Claims 2, 4, 7 14-16, 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Saeki and Angwin in view of Chitradon et al (US 7,308,117).

The claims are amended to clarify the claim language and eliminate redundancy. Support for the amendments is present in at least pages 16-18 of the specification.

With regard to claim 3, Applicant submits that the combination of Saeki and Angwin does not teach or suggest providing “common name information for the road such that the integrated name data provides a single set of name data for the road for use in all of the map area blocks through which the route passes.” Although the Office Action recognizes that Saeki does not disclose the above-mentioned common name information feature of the claim, it asserts that Angwin discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Angwin does not make the alleged disclosure.

Angwin is directed to a method and apparatus in which sign text on guide signs for exit ramps is computed and displayed on a map. *See Abstract*. Angwin discloses that (A) duplicate street names and/or identifiers from fork handle sign text variables of each of the forks of a compound exit ramp may be removed, and (B) different versions of the same street name or route identifier in the fork handle sign text variables of the forks of the compound ramp are merged into a more general version of the name/identifier. *Col. 9, lines 57-67*.

Angwin’s disclosures, however, are only directed to simplification of exit ramp names. There is no teaching or suggestion in Angwin of providing a single set of name data for a road for all of the map area blocks along a route. Although Angwin simplifies the names of the various exit ramps, the name data for the roads is not simplified at all. Accordingly, Angwin does not provide a single set of name data for a road in the map area blocks along a route.

Further, Angwin does not teach or suggest anything about map area blocks, and thus its disclosures regarding sign text for exit ramps are unrelated to map area blocks. The Office Action relies on Saeki as disclosing map area blocks, but this reliance is misplaced.

Although Saeki illustrates maps in FIGS. 15 to 17 that appear to have equally-sized rectangular (square) regions, Saeki does not disclose that its map regions have any particular relationship to the road data or name data in the map. Moreover, in Saeki's disclosures regarding the division of map data into figure parts, the figure parts are elements such as national roads, traffic lights, parking lots and building facilities. *Col. 8, lines 24-30*. Thus, the division of Saeki's map data into figure parts does not correspond to the map area blocks of Applicant's claims.

Accordingly, combining Angwin's exit ramp naming scheme to Saeki's teachings would not result in the invention claimed in Applicant's claim 3. At most, such a combination would result in a mapping scheme in which sign text for exit ramps in Saeki's maps would have simplified names. This combination, however, would not result in the single set of name data for the road for the plurality of map area blocks that is required by claim 3. Rather, even if the combined teachings were further modified to include the map area blocks as claimed in claim 3, in view of the disclosures of the cited references, it is clear that the road name data in the Saeki/Angwin combination would be repeated over and over again from one map area block to another.

As described above, Saeki lacks any disclosure of a relationship between the name data and map area blocks of the map. Accordingly, Saeki also fails to disclose the "extracting" step of the method of claim 3 in which name information indicating names of the roads in each of the map area blocks is provided.

Therefore, amended claim 3 is patentable over Saeki and Angwin for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Saeki and Angwin for reasons analogous to those for claim 3.

Claims 5, 8-11, 17, 20 and 22 are patentable due to their dependence from claims 1, 3 and 6, respectively.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 14-16, 18, 19 and 21 are patentable due to their dependence from claims 1, 3 and 6, respectively, and because Chitradon does not make up for the above-identified deficiencies of Saeki and Angwin.

Applicant further submits that Saeki, Angwin and Chitradon do not teach or suggest that “the integrated name data provides the common name information such that the integrated name data provides the single set of name data in the plurality of the map layers,” as claimed in claims 2, 4 and 7. The Office Action relies on the combination of Saeki and Angwin as disclosing this feature of the claims.

Saeki discloses that different groups of figure parts (national roads, traffic lights, parking lots and building facilities) have different priorities. Angwin discloses that different forks of an exit ramp can have the same name.

Neither of these references, however, discloses providing the single set of name data for the road, which is used in the map area blocks, in the plurality of map layers. As described in Applicant’s specification and illustrated in FIG. 6, for example, by using common name data for the road in the various map blocks and layers the amount of data for the roads is reduced. Neither the assignment of various priorities to elements in a map nor the assignment of the same name to different forks in an exit ramp corresponds to providing a single set of name data in a plurality of map layers.

Therefore, claims 2, 4 and 7 are patentable over Saeki, Angwin and Chitradon for this additional reason.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 029267.56097US.

Respectfully submitted,

March 29, 2011



Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169  
Cameron W. Beddard  
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:CWB:crr  
14774255